	Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)				
Interview Summary	10/081,935		COX ET AL.				
	Examiner		Art Unit				
	Padmavathi v	Baskar	1645				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):							
(1) <u>Padmavathi v Baskar</u> .	(3)						
(2) Shelley Fussey.	(4)		•				
Date of Interview: 19 April 2004.							
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]							
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.						
Claim(s) discussed:							
Identification of prior art discussed:							
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. o	g)⊠ was not re	eached. h)∐ N	/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and the attorney discussed the rejections of record and examiner explained about enablement issues. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.							
Summary of Necord of Interview requirements of reverse s	ide of off attac	illed Sileet.					
•			÷				
•							
			•				
			٠				
				,			
	-						
			•				
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.		Examiner's signa	ature, if required				

	Application No	Э.	Applicant(s)				
Interview Summary	10/081,935	COX ET AL.					
	Examiner	<u>.</u>	Art Unit				
	Padmavathi v I	Baskar	1645				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):							
(1) <u>Padmavathi v Baskar</u> .	(3)		·				
(2) Shelley Fussey.	(4)	•					
Date of Interview: 19 April 2004.	•						
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]							
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)∏ No.			•			
Claim(s) discussed:							
Identification of prior art discussed:				·			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g)⊠ was not re	ached. h)∐ I	N/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>The examiner and the attorney discussed the rejections of record and examiner explained about enablement issues.</u>							
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)							
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.							
		•					
:							
		•		·			
	\						
			•	:			
•							
•				,			
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an		×					
Attachment to a signed Office action.		Examiner's sig	nature, if require	ed			